Remark

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. No Claims have been amended. Claims 11-21 have been previously cancelled. Therefore, claims 1-10 and 22-32 are present for examination.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

Kerr in view of Molitor

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 8-9, 22-24, 26, and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kerr in view of Molitor, U.S. Patent No. 6,661,799 ("Molitor"). In this rejection, the Examiner has acknowledged that Kerr still fails to anticipate any of the claims of the present application. Molitor is relied upon to show the first packet-processing application initiating a second packet-processing application of the plurality of packet-processing applications and providing a tagged packet to the second packet processing application.

Claim 1, for example further is directed to a plurality of packet processing applications at a network device, each having access to the same unified cache using a cache lookup key. It is the cache lookup key with which the packet has been tagged.

In Molitor, the two applications A1, R1 are at different hosts A and R and do not have access to a unified cache. Similarly, Applicants do not find any suggestion that a packet be tagged with a cache lookup key. On the contrary, it would appear that port numbers are used (see e.g. 10:23-36) and that the only changes from conventional address and port number use is in the NAT. Finally, it does not appear that A1 or R1 initiates the other, as recited in Claim 1.

Attorney Docket No. 42P12323
Application No. 09/967,084   2

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims of the present application are allowable over the cited combination of references because the references fail to teach or suggest the features mentioned above.

Applicants further submit that it would not be obvious to modify Molitor in the manner suggested by the Examiner as this would defeat the purpose of Molitor. Molitor is directed to allowing two applications to traverse a NAT by modifying the NAT. Kerr, on the other hand, is directed to routing message flows through routers. Modifying Molitor, as suggested by the Examiner would involve applying teachings regarding modifying a NAT to router tables in a manner that was not contemplated in Molitor and which would make the NAT modifications superfluous.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome by the amendment and remark, and that the claims as amended are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the rejections be withdrawn and the claims as amended be allowed.

Attorney Docket No. 42P12323
Application No. 09/967,084   3

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension. Charge our Deposit Account.

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: <u>December 5, 2005</u>

Gordon R. Lindeen III
Reg. No. 33,192

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980

Attorney Docket No. 42P12323
Application No. 09/967,084   4